

The Sun

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1896.

The Right Thing to Do.

The best way for Congress to deal with the dispute with Mr. CLEVELAND as to the authority of Congress to recognize the independence of Cuba, is to adopt the Cameron resolutions, which provide for the recognition of Cuba's independence.

This ought to be done before the brief period remaining to the present Congress shall be frittered away in debate over a number of the provisions in the United States Constitution.

The enemies of Cuban recognition in the Senate and in the House can keep up a debate in regard to these provisions for months running. Secretary OLNEY can hold argument about them so long as he stays in office. Mr. CLEVELAND can trifle with them till the end of his term.

When the Cameron resolutions shall be passed by both houses of Congress, transmitted to the Executive, and then, if it is necessary, passed over his veto by the requisite majority, there will be time for argument upon those passages of the Constitution which are the subject of controversy. The circumstances will then be more favorable for a polemic upon them.

When the resolutions have passed through their final stage in Congress, we shall see in a few days what Mr. CLEVELAND will do about them.

We shall also probably see the correctness of the judgment of Prime Minister CANOVAS, when he recently declared through that trustworthy organ of his Ministry, the *Epoca* of Madrid, that the "passage of the Cameron resolutions would not be the cause of serious perturbation in Spain."

The Alleged Warning to the United States.

Sometimes the bogus news concocted for stock-rigging purposes is ingenious and plausible; but this can hardly be said of the despatch from Paris to the *London Times* conveying the would-be startling information that the European powers have informed our Government that they "could not remain inactive" in the event of the United States abandoning the attitude of President CLEVELAND and his Cabinet with regard to Cuba. The attitude from which, according to this sapient correspondent, we must not depart is that of stiff-backed refusal to recognize the Cuban revolutionists either as belligerents or as an independent republic, although both houses of Congress should request such recognition.

There might have been something specious in this roborating had it been started in the year 1822 instead of 1896. In the former year Russia, Austria, Prussia, and France agreed at the Congress of Verona upon armed intervention in Spain for the purpose of overthrowing the liberal Constitution recently adopted in that country and restoring the despotism of FERDINAND VII. It had also been notorious for upward of twelve months that the same powers were considering the expediency of helping Spain with their fleets and armies to recover her American possessions. Under those circumstances it would have surprised nobody had the four powers, linked together in the mis-called "Holy Alliance," intimated that they "could not remain inactive" should the United States recognize the independence of the Spanish-American revolutionists. Their feeling on the subject was well known; but a knowledge of the feeling did not prevent President MONROE from sending to Congress on March 8, 1822, a special message recommending that the independence of certain Spanish-American provinces should be recognized, and that appropriations should be made for the maintenance of an embargo accredited to the new republic. In 1823 an impressive demonstration of the retractionary purposes of the Holy Alliance was afforded by the despatch of a French army into Spain, which in six months overran the country and abolished its parliamentary institutions. This army remained in Spain until 1827, and a part or all of it might have been transferred to Spanish-America. Such a transfer was contemplated, and it was in the teeth of that contingency that President MONROE sent to Congress his seventh annual message, in which he made the memorable announcement of the so-called Monroe doctrine. Therein, as it will be remembered, he told the Continental powers that "with the American Government who had declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we had, in great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any intervention for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." Inasmuch as CANNING made a similar protest on behalf of the British Government, and as England and the United States between them could easily control the sea, the Continental powers thought better of their intention to assist Spain in subjugating her revolted colonies. President MONROE, accordingly, was able to say a year later: "It is impossible for the European Governments to interfere in the concerns of our country, and especially in those which are vital, without affecting us; indeed, the motives which might induce such interference in the present state of the war between the parties, would appear to be equally applicable to us. It is gratifying to know that some of the powers with whom we enjoy a very friendly intercourse, and to whom these views have been communicated, have appeared to acquiesce in them." If such acquiescence in the declared will of the American people was deemed expedient when the United States had only about 10,000,000 inhabitants, it is preposterous to assume with the Paris correspondent of the *Times* that any of the Continental powers would undertake to browbeat or coerce us now when our population exceeds seventy millions.

As President MONROE pointed out in his first annual message, the United States, "through every stage of the conflict" between Spain and her American colonies, had maintained an impartial neutrality between the combatants, regarding the contest as a "civil war" and recognizing the revolutionists as belligerents. Mr. CLEVELAND might have given like recognition to the Cubans a year ago and not a word of protest would have been uttered by any European power. No word of protest could be uttered, in view of the fact that at the outset of our own civil war, before the first battle of Bull Run was fought, when it was as yet undetermined whether the civil war, then threatened, would not be over in ninety days, England, France, and Spain recognized the Confederates as belligerents.

In the light of the law of nations and of the precedents made by our treatment of other Spanish-American revolutionists, no possible objection can be made to the recognition of Cubans as belligerents except in being true, of course, that a declaration of neutrality would expose our vessels to the exercise of the right of search by Spain. This was as true a year ago as it is now, but seeing that for a twelvemonth longer the Cubans have proved their ability to withstand the whole might of Spain, it seems that equity requires us to go one step further, and formally recognize the independence which the Cubans have shown themselves qualified to maintain. That in presence of such a recognition on our part the Continental powers "could not remain inactive" is a ridiculous assumption when we remember that they remained inactive enough in 1823, when at one stroke President MONROE saw fit to recognize the independence of a number of Spanish-American republics.

The silly despatch from Paris to the *London Times* takes for granted that the Triple Alliance and the Franco-Russian League, whose interests are irreconcilable, would make common cause for the purpose of supporting Spain, which they care nothing about, and of besting the United States, the good will of which is coveted by both coalitions. The notion that France would act in such a manner without the Czar's consent and that the Czar would sanction an attempt to bully the United States, may be said to cap the climax of absurdity.

The Third Party in the Case.

There is another party besides Mr. CLEVELAND and Prime Minister CANOVAS DEL CASTILLO who must take part in any negotiations for the ending of the war in Cuba. Whatever may be said by CLEVELAND and CANOVAS, there is a Government of the republic of Cuba which commands the loyalty of a revolutionary army, at once powerful and warlike. This is a party that must be consulted by the Spanish Government and by the American President before either of them can do anything to bring about the pacification of Cuba. This third party is a very important one, and is not to be neglected by the two other parties. They must ascertain upon what terms the party of the third part would be willing to make peace. They could not consummate or execute any plan for the settlement of the troubles in Cuba until the consent of the revolution was obtained. This is a serious matter, one not to be slighted.

Mr. CLEVELAND tells us in his message, as he had previously told Spain's Premier, that he would like to have the Cuban war brought to an end. It is his opinion that Spain ought to grant "home rule" to Cuba, and he makes the observation that "no reason is perceived why it should not be approved by the insurgents." He informs us that an intimation of this kind was communicated by him to Spain some months ago.

But then suppose that the third party in the case does not agree with this superannuated opinion? Suppose that Cuba would not accept any measure of "home rule" that could be granted to her by Spain under the Spanish system of government? Suppose that the revolutionary patriots in arms were to refuse to assent to the existence of Spanish rule in their country, under any promise from Spain? Here, indeed, would be trouble for both of the other parties. What could be done next in pursuance of the negotiations between Mr. CLEVELAND and Spain? We learn from CLEVELAND's message that no definite response to his proposition has been received from Premier CANOVAS, though some months have passed since it was made, perhaps as many as six or eight months. Possibly Spain is thinking of it, Spanish fashion, while its author says he maintains an "expectant attitude."

We may next take notice of Premier CANOVAS's plan for the ending of the war. We learn from Mr. CLEVELAND's message that it begins with "unconditional surrender on the part of the insurgent Cubans." We have learned from Señor CANOVAS that the war against Cuba will be carried on with all the resources of Spain until the rebels lay down their arms, and after they have done that, it will be time to grant such reforms as his Government may consider necessary. The President has repeated these statements officially many times this year. He will make no terms with rebels in arms. Here again, as it will be observed, there is trouble of a serious kind for more than one of the parties.

For, suppose that the Cuban Government and army shall decline to surrender, unconditionally or otherwise? Suppose that President CIESEROS-BETANCOURT should refuse to listen to the CANOVAS proposition, as to that of Mr. CLEVELAND? Suppose that Gen. GOMEZ and the revolution should turn a deaf ear to the Spanish Premier's demand, and tell him that his "reforms" would be worthless, even if they were ever granted? What next would the Premier do in pursuance of his uncompromising policy? We do not see that there is any prospect of putting an end to the war in CANOVAS's way.

So, then, after all, the third party cannot be overlooked in any negotiations with Spain into which Mr. CLEVELAND may desire to enter. CLEVELAND may draw up one plan and CANOVAS another; but if Cuba rejects each of the inappropriate plans proposed for her acceptance, both of the other parties will be out in the cold.

It is a war for independence in which Cuba has been engaged for the past two years. It is a revolution with which Spain is contending. It is freedom from Spanish rule, not any promise of "reform" under that rule, for which the heroic armies of the young republic are in the field. They are filled with determination. They are emboldened by the successes they have won. The thought of compromise under CLEVELAND's plan, or of surrender under CANOVAS's plan, has no place in their mind. With them, it is a battle to the death; and there can be no peace in Cuba until freedom shall be crushed in its own ruins, or until independence shall be won by revolution.

The New Reservoir Site Law.

To a large portion of our country, the part which philosophically and fortunately takes a pride in calling itself "Arid America," the question of irrigation is perhaps the most important one it has to consider. In fact, its progress and its very existence depend on the solution of this problem. Happily, there is no grumbling there over the unequal climatic conditions of the different sections of the country, nor over the fact that the rain so rarely falls either on the just or the unjust. The people take to ditching and to bringing the water to their farms by more or less expensive processes, and when they find their labors rewarded by harvests remarkable in abundance and quality, they have a kind of pity for what they call "the rain-fall States."

An important law to the arid regions has just been enacted by Congress. It was passed by the Senate at the last session, and the House has now concurred in it. The bill provides that any person or live stock or transportation company engaged in breeding, grazing, driving, or transporting live stock, may construct reservoirs upon unoccupied public lands of the United States, not mineral or otherwise reserved, for the purpose of furnishing water to such live stock, and shall have control of such reservoirs, and of lands adjacent to the extent of not more than 160 acres. The control is subject to rules made by the Interior Department and is to last while water is kept in the reservoir. The reservoir must not be fenced in, but must be open to any one for the watering of animals.

The necessity for this law is found in the fact that in the high lands of the Northwest, where water is scarce, and where such reservoirs and dams are constructed, the land is now subject to homestead entry or settlement, so taking away from the persons who have built the reservoirs all the benefits they hoped for. This new bill does not give title to the reservoir lands, but will practically operate, for the present, to keep them from settlement by others, yet only on condition of opening these valuable reservoirs and dams to the public use. The reservoirs cannot be put on public lands reserved for other uses.

Altogether the law seems to be a good one, and should have the effect of increasing the number of temporary watering places for cattle that graze or are driven upon the plains.

Canada Takes Some Islands.

Canada has recently decided that part of her vast landed estate lying mainly north of white settlements into five districts. The name Franklin will be spread on her maps all over the Arctic islands north of the continent. Ungava takes in all of Labrador except the coast fringe, which is Newfoundland's stamping ground. Then there is Yukon, where real estate is more or less sprinkled with gold; Mackenzie, bisected by Canada's biggest river, and Keewatin, the district organized some years ago west of Hudson Bay. Its boundaries were then defined so as to include most of the northern coast and, and, and, it is now extended to the Arctic Ocean, its population is increased by nearly all the musk oxen.

It is not likely to be regarded as a *casus belli*, but the fact is that Canada has gathered into her grabnet some of our islands. Her only title to extend the name Franklin over the Arctic Archipelago rests upon the British exploration of that part of the world during the search for Sir JOHN FRANKLIN. Well, we took part in that search ourselves, and made some discoveries of our own; and if we do not raise the Stars and Stripes over the lands we discovered and named, it is not because our title is clouded, but because we are willing Canada should jump the claim if she can get any fun out of it.

A large island in the Parry Archipelago was discovered on Sept. 21, 1850, by the first Grinnell expedition, which had been fitted out by HENRY GRINNELL, the first President of the American Geographical Society, to take part in the Franklin search. It was named Grinnell Island "in honor of the head and heart of the man in whose philanthropic mind originated the idea of this expedition, and to whose munificence it owes its existence."

In 1853 HENRY GRINNELL and GEORGE PEABODY sent out Dr. KANE to search for FRANKLIN in the direction of Smith Sound. He was the first explorer to pass through that strait, to cross Kane Sea, and ascend Kennedy Channel; and the long western coast which he surveyed far north to Carl Ritter Bay he named Grinnell Land. Mr. GRINNELL, he wrote in his book, "was a liberality altogether characteristic, had placed the Advance at my disposal for the cruise."

It was not until 1871 that human eyes, unless they belonged to Eskimos, ever saw the northern extension of Grinnell Land. They were American eyes, too, and the region they revealed was named Grant Land by Dr. BESSLES of the Polar expedition. These interesting though remote and chilly parts of the world which we discovered are well sprinkled with American names, including that of Judge CHARLES P. DALY, the honored President of the American Geographical Society, to show that we have been there. Canada has carefully defined the eastern boundary of Franklin so as to include them all.

This shows how much better it would be for all concerned for Canada to be a part of the North American Union, with all questions of boundary permanently swept away.

The Poor and the Rich.

We publish elsewhere a letter from a "Poor Man" in which heartlessness is attributed to THE SUN because it has asked what are the wrongs of the poor man about which we hear so much.

Our correspondent does not specify any such wrongs, except by implying that the wrongs of the poor are sentimental: are offences against his sensibility and self-respect. "Wherever the poor man goes, except in Roman Catholic churches," he says, "he is unwelcome." Even if that were true, it would not be wrong inflicted on the poor man. It would only be incivility at most, and it might not be even that. A cordial welcome is a free will offering. You cannot exact welcome from other people, for if it is compulsory it is not welcome. You can compel respect, but you cannot force love and affection. If, too, there is no society to which a man is welcome, it is obvious that he does not deserve the greeting. If a man has no friends, there must be something wrong in himself rather than in his treatment by other people. Moreover, a man, whether he is rich or poor, has a right to choose his own friends. Kindness, humanity, consideration, are a general obligation; friendship and intimate social intercourse are no man's right, but are privileges received by him, whose grant is wholly within the discretion of the unsalable and uncontrollable inclination of every individual. The old proverb, kissing goes by favor, expresses a liberty in friendship, affection, and familiar association of which nobody can be rightfully deprived, and which is exercised by every human heart instinctively and independently. Every man has a right to choose his own company; and if he gets into company in which he is not wanted, he has no reason to complain because he is unwelcome. People choose their company according to their likes and dislikes; but who is there that has not somebody to like him? If a man cannot get a welcome in one place, are there not other places where his presence brings pleasure? Is there not as much affection among the poor as among the rich? Of all the blessings enjoyed by men and women, what else is

so universal and so impartial in its distribution as love and affection?

It is not true, however, that the poor are unwelcome in Protestant churches. Nothing would more rejoice the Protestant pastor than to see their churches crowded with the poor of whom our correspondent speaks. Their main effort is to attract those poor; and so far as they are unable to draw them into their churches, they feel that they lay themselves open to reproach. The Protestant parishes of this city are all strenuous in their endeavors to gain the favor of the poor; eager to welcome them. Sometimes they even go so far as to hunt them up and almost pay them for attending their services. No poor man is ever unwelcome in a Protestant church, no matter how fashionable it may be. If he keeps away, it is because the church is distasteful to him, not because he is unwelcome to it.

Who are the poor? Our correspondent says that "one-half the people in the larger towns get their living and their wealth by preying on the other half." But that cannot be so, because the rich are not one-half of the people; they are not a tenth part of them; are hardly a hundredth part. It may be said that everybody preys on his fellows. He gets as much as he can from them for his labor, his services, his goods, or the use of his possessions. Only paupers, who prefer to be drones living on charity, are outside of that competition. All men who have to work for their living are poor. Only those who have accumulated fortunes, and who are millionaires, are outside of such labor, are rich; and even the rich must struggle to keep their riches.

The number of the rich, then, is so small comparatively that the community generally may be said to be poor; hence if the poor suffer wrongs, nearly all society is wronged. But who wrongs them? Who wrongs those who are born amid surroundings of hardship? And by whose partiality are a few born amid wealth and its opportunities? Who makes some children congenital cripples, weaklings, defective, while others come into the world with strong minds and bodies? Who is responsible for the inheritance of the instinct of acquisitiveness and aptitude for accumulation by one man, and for the inheritance of a thriftless disposition by another?

Our correspondent cries in vain, "The cry against nature and the laws of the universe. It is God against Whom he brings his bitter accusation."

A Grand Old Man.

WESTON, at the age of 58, and white-headed, performed a feat last night which more than one member of his profession have failed in when blooming with youth. Twenty-six years ago, or at the age of 33, he not much more than missed it in his attempt to cover 100 miles in twenty-four hours. He finished handsomely then, as they say, but at about the middle of his task the outlook was very doubtful. He failed yesterday to accomplish what he set out to do, but he made a great performance nevertheless, going more than 100 miles in less than twenty-four hours.

Considering these two achievements, only, we should have to conclude that WESTON is better at about sixty than he was when thirty. When WESTON, in England, put the six days' record at 550 miles, medical experts who observed him there attributed his success to his extraordinary powers of physical recuperation. A few moments' rest would make him another man. This peculiar sort of vitality has done the greater half of keeping the strength of his old age up to the athletic point, and the other half probably has been done by temperance. To the normal man, said a drop of deterioration. Alcohol is a powerful and useful agent, but the great athlete is the one who can do without it.

The powers which seem to have left WESTON's strength untouched, have left a beneficent mark, however, on his mind. In the heyday of his professional career he was as cranky and fidgety a subject as ever tried a trainer's tact. This last and by all odds most extraordinary feat of his, and perhaps of all men, was executed with the calmness of a philosopher. It shows that WESTON regards himself as having passed from the ranks of mere pedestrians, and as having become dedicated to science, which never tolerates passion or excitement, and requires its votaries to think of it and not of themselves. The physical and mental sides of WESTON's maturity are worthy the study of all men of advancing years.

Yesterday's walk was a highly interesting and useful performance. We congratulate all our fellow citizens on its success, but particularly the distinguished gentlemen at whose request it was attempted. WESTON, namely, his good honor the Mayor of New York; Dr. CHAUNCEY M. DEWEY, representing oratory and the great railroad interest; the Hon. E. ELLERY ANDERSON, representing the better element; the Hon. THOMAS L. JAMES, representing the Republican party; and the Hon. JOEL B. EMMERT and the Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, representing something between ANDERSON and JAMES.

Well may the flag float at half mast on the outer bar of the Great South Bay, and well may the brine in the eyes of the Captain's comrades moisten their bronzed cheeks as they tell the news of the loss of SYRUS BAKER of Lone Hill. They say he "caught his death" in rescuing the crew of a schooner stranded upon a treacherous part of the bleak Long Island coast. Honor to his name and memory!

For the Relief of Pennsylvania Hens.

Among the many resources of the State of Pennsylvania is a Department of Agriculture, the head of which, the Hon. THOMAS J. BAKER, has been frequently mentioned down by the side of the Hon. JULIUS STREET, MONTGOMERY, Government agriculture, whether under the patronage of a State or the Federal authorities, is always something to be grateful for. For one thing, it calls forth a vast amount of reports and bulletins, and benefits composers and the manufacturers of white paper and ink. For another thing, the writing of these bulletins and reports is a great happiness to the learned persons who write them. We regret that the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture's Bulletin No. 17, on "Diseases of Poultry and the Furred and Feathered Enemies of Domestic Fowls," did not reach this office in time to be read and approved before Christmas Day. Then, even more than before, there is a benign interest in poultry, and those who have never seen a live hen. Yet young students of the science of carving cannot do better than to procure a copy of this work, and master the plates and description of a skeleton of a fowl, apparently some sort of a giraffe. It is well to prepare for New Year's, and even experienced carvers may find valuable hints by investigating the stylized prolongation of the transverse process of the third vertebra, the interorbital septum, the coracoid bone, and the first phalanx of the large digit of the wing.

The learned authors of this treatise inform the public that "the economic status of the Cooper and Sharp-shinned Hawks, the Great Horned Owl, and the Minck Hawk, have been investigated with particular care, and it is clearly proven that they are detrimental." Cooper's, the Sharp-shinned Hawk,

and the Minck there will be no regret in seeing outlawed; but it is difficult to repress grief at the thought that the economic status of the Great Horned Owl has been found unsatisfactory. The name is a poem; it is unfortunate if this age doesn't live up to it. As the Great Horned Owl's "raids among domestic fowls of all kinds are well known to every farmer," it was necessary, of course, for the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture to investigate this bird's economic status, and inform the farmers that he was a detrimental. It also informs them that to tell an owl from a hawk they are situated in the front of the head and look forward, while the hawk's eyes are directed to either side."

But how is a Pennsylvanian to know a hawk from a hand saw, when the wind is southerly? It seems strange that nothing is said on this point, on account of its Shakespearean if not its ornithological interest, for a poetical bent is revealed more than once in these pages. In particular, the learned writer of the "Preliminary Report Concerning Some Furred and Feathered Enemies of Domestic Fowls" tempers the severity of scientific exposition with the graces of poetic style. Even in his sub-heads he courts the Muse. Thus he tells us that the wildcat "hunts the quillful porcupine." But it is when he comes to the gifted animal, the shrew, that the inspiration becomes an exhalation. "We arrange in periodical prose, but with no other change than the addition of a few capital letters, this Lay of the Wreaser or Song of the Stomat."

"Game larger than himself, he seldom takes to the open—carry no Fear to his little heart, as he bounds along all winter, or runs with remarkable celerity in search of prey. Not to the land alone does he confine himself in this search. He is an underwater passage. Made by the rabbit or mouse, and also in the water, his long, slender body aiding his advance. The mouse and who has passed on some low bush to earl forth his song. Or wet his parched throat at the running brook. He frequently meets the death of the night. By the teeth of this little creature."

It seems that the technical name of the wren is Putorius, but he has no reason to sue for libel. The genius of the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture has made him sweet with song. This genius is at times a little uncertain in syntax, but always of a tender idyllic cast.

It is a disgrace to England that millions of her subjects in India, who have borne heavy burdens for the glory of the British empire, are left to starve. The compassionate people of Russia, who, under the promptings of humanity, have made contributions for the relief of the sufferers, will surely have a reward in their gratitude.

Mr. ALBERT SHAW, who has attained some reputation as a theorist on social and economic subjects, was quoted in an interview on the gas question in the *New York Times* yesterday, as follows:

"The gas companies are obliged to earn dividends on capital which has accumulated in the development of the industry. This is not the fault of the public, and the public should not be obliged to pay it. Neither is it the fault of the present stockholders of the gas companies, who have paid the market value of the stock, based on the earnings of the companies. It is the fault of the system of corporate organization in this country."

It ought to be a matter of public congratulation that the Populists, in the present attack upon the gas companies and other corporations, have at last been frankly and adequately stated.

It was in vain that Major MCKINLEY sought for rest in Chicago. After staying there a few days, he hastened back to Canton. The right place for the President-elect to take a rest before he goes to Washington is New York. He can find pleasant quarters here where no man will disturb him, if he shall take the trouble to inform Chief CONSTABLE that he does not want to be disturbed. He can spend the next two months here in philosophic calm, without ever having his door bell rung. Here are the gleaming rivers, the soothing sea, the placid lake, and the reposeful woods in wintry garb.

In the thrilling annals of the United States life-saving service, in the many official volumes containing reports of the deeds of the brave men engaged in it, there is no name more worthy of honor than that of Capt. SYRUS BAKER of Lone Hill, who died on Thursday. Hundreds of men and women owe their lives to the hero of the stormy deep. However wild the sea, or high the breakers, or on the bleak coast, or tempestuous sea, or black the night, it needed but a signal of danger, a cry of distress, or a knowledge that some one was in peril, to stir his soul and cause him to rush to the rescue. His lifeboats were always ready, and he was never beyond the scene of his time for patrol duty was measured only by the hours in the day; he was full of resources as of daring; he bore trials that few others could bear; he was ever ready to risk his own life for the sake of that of others; he would die to save one who was in danger to venture; he would climb the rigging of a sinking ship to help any one who had sought refuge there; he would swim out to offer his strong hand to one who was drowning; he was, indeed, an honor to the life-saving service.

Well may the flag float at half mast on the outer bar of the Great South Bay, and well may the brine in the eyes of the Captain's comrades moisten their bronzed cheeks as they tell the news of the loss of SYRUS BAKER of Lone Hill. They say he "caught his death" in rescuing the crew of a schooner stranded upon a treacherous part of the bleak Long Island coast. Honor to his name and memory!

It was an interesting revelation which we got in a recent Havana letter to THE SUN that the patriots have frequently procured military munitions by purchase from the officers of the Spanish army. It was stated in the letter that two Spanish Colonels belonging to the garrison at Guanabacoa had been implicated in secret dealings with the revolutionists. "The Spanish soldiers," said our correspondent, "are so hungry and so ill treated that they sell their cartridges to the insurgents."

There are not a few Spanish officers in Cuba who have made money during the war by blackmailing, by the plundering of villages, by levying assessments upon planters and manufacturers, and by selling arms to the enemies of Spain.

The Cubans have many times procured military supplies by capturing them upon the battlefield, by buying them from the commanders of Spanish garrisons, and by the help of adventurers who have taken them to Cuba in ships. At all times, in peace or in war, the political and military agents of Spain in Cuba have made it their chief business to secure riches at the expense of the Cuban people.

When WESTON shall leave Cuba for Spain, he will take with him the fortune which he has gained by having and fraud.

Mr. Guthrie and Edmund Burke.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I impeach W. D. Guthrie as being first, last, and all the time a plagiarist. I impeach W. D. Guthrie as being unworthy to deliver an oration before a body of men, and I impeach him for his oration was an adaptation to complete of Edmund Burke's speech at the impeachment of Warren Hastings. It is a crime against Choate to employ such an agent. "His peccare in bello non licet."

CHRISTOPHER G. LANGDON.

NOTES OF LEGAL EVENTS.

The reception given by the Colonial Club on Wednesday evening to the members of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court in this city was attended by a large number of the well-known lawyers and Judges, who were treated with the utmost hospitality by their courteous hosts, under the direction of Mr. L. Laflin Kellogg, the President of the club. Mr. Justice Peckham of the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Wm. H. Peckham, and Mr. William B. Hornblower were among the guests. Presiding Justice Van Brunt of the Appellate Division here, made a plain, common sense speech, telling what the court had accomplished during the first year of its existence, and giving some account of its methods of work. His remarks indicated that he was not dissatisfied with the change from the old General Term system introduced by the new Constitution. Two of the seven Justices of the Appellate Division in this department will continue their present terms in 1897—Presiding Justice Van Brunt and Judge Fardon C. Smith. Mr. Justice Peckham will continue in the office of the Appellate Division, and will have certain of refection. Judge Williams comes from the Ulica district, and presided at the Bat Shea murder trial in Troy.

An important decision in its practical bearing upon negligence suits is the reversal by the Court of Appeals of the judgment of the General Term in the Fifth Department in the case of Annie Mitchell against the Rochester Railway Company. Mrs. Mitchell, while trying to board one of the defendant's cars in Rochester, was badly frightened by the sudden and close approach of another car, whose team turned toward her and came so near that when the horses were stopped she found herself standing between their heads. She became unconscious, suffered a miscarriage subsequently, and died. The trial judge found for the plaintiff, and the Court of Appeals has reversed the judgment, and has ordered a new trial.

The Court of Appeals holds, however, that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury to the person, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The Court also held that a plaintiff cannot recover for injuries occasioned by fright arising out of negligence where there is no immediate injury to the person. In the case of Mitchell, the Court found that there was an immediate injury